

### REMARKS

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 4-6 have been canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair et al. (U.S. 2002/0087440) in view of Biffar (U.S. 5,903,880). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest checking the consistency of the received transaction voucher data with regard to a process procedure of a work defined by a plurality of actions performed by transmitting the transaction voucher data, including the action corresponding to the transaction voucher data received by the computer, as described in the claims. Definition data defines in advance the process procedure of the work as a sequence of the actions (see Figs. 2A and 2B, for example).

The Blair et al. reference discloses a system for validating bill of materials (BOM) information, which includes use of a template that defines a BOM information structure. As shown in Fig. 5A, the reference discloses a number of information categories 508 and information validation rules 514 with respect to each of the record types 502. The validation rules provide direction as to what to do in the event the organization sends a series of flat files to the service provider and later-sent file contains information for a particular field which is inconsistent with information for the same field included in an earlier-sent file (see paragraphs [0076-0077]). Thus, the Blair et al. reference teaches information categories and validation rules within each of the record types.

In the present invention, in contrast, the consistency of the received transaction voucher data is checked with respect to a process procedure of a work defined by a plurality of sequence of actions, and not just within one action. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in the Blair et al. reference.

The secondary reference Biffer et al. is not cited for disclosing the consistency checking features of the present invention. Therefore, even if combined, they still would not disclose or suggest these features as described in the claims. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 7-9 are believed to be allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

March 14, 2008

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\3408\68743\CO8404.DOC